

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicants amend the specification to correct an informality. No new matter is added.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Reis during the October 25 telephone interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

The Office Action objects to the disclosure for an informality. By this Amendment, Applicants amend the specification to correct the informality. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

The Office Action Rejects claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 11, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0088332 A1 to Lee et al. (hereinafter "Lee"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As agreed during the October 25 telephone interview, Lee does not qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) according to the provisions of MPEP § 2136.03, paragraph IV. Accordingly, the rejection is improper. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

The Office Action Rejects claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 12, 16, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Lee in view of U.S. Patent Application 6,363,179 B1 to Evans et al. (hereinafter "Evans"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

This rejection is premised upon the presumption that Lee qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Because, as discussed above, Lee does not qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), the rejection is improper. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

The Office Action Rejects claims 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Lee in view in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0070139 A1 to Marshall et al. (hereinafter "Marshall"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

This rejection is premised upon the presumption that Lee qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Because, as discussed above, Lee does not qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), the rejection is improper. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.


The Office Action Rejects claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Lee in view of Evans, and further in view of Marshall. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

This rejection is premised upon the presumption that Lee qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Because, as discussed above, Lee does not qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), the rejection is improper. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

In view of at least the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Applicants earnestly solicit favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-17.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Jesse O. Collier
Registration No. 53,839

JAO:JOC/tea

Date: October 26, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--